Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Grateful acknowledgments are due to Dr. John M. Coulter and Professor E. B. Uline for kindly determining some of the species and checking most of the list of collections.

WABASH COLLEGE, CRAWFORDSVILLE, IND.

On the two Editions of Emory's Report, 1848.

For some time past I have been aware of the fact that there were two editions of Lieut. W. H. Emory's "Notes of a Military Reconnoissance," both bearing the same date (1848); but I supposed they were identical, except that one had appended to it the reports of Abert and Cooke and the journal of Johnston. But I now possess copies of both of these books, and find that they differ in various details, which are of importance on account of Prof. Torrey's reports on the botany of the expedition.

Both editions are Executive Documents of the 30th Congress, 1st session, and they are numbered 7 and 41, respectively. No. 7 was issued for the Senate. It contains nothing but Emory's report, with its seven appendices, and consists of 416 pages. Each age has [↖] in the upper external corner. No. 41 was issued for the House. It contains the reports of Emory, Abert and Cooke, and Johnston's journal, and consists of 614 pages. "Ex. Doc. No. 41," appears in the middle of the top of each page, with the exception of pp. 145–158, in the botanical portion, which have [7] in the upper external corner. This is evidently a typographical error, and not a mistake in binding, for the pages are not the same as pp. 145–158 in No. 7.

In both of these volumes Professor Torrey's report on Emory's plants occupies pp. 135–159, constituting Appendix No. 2. My copy of No. 41 bears the following manuscript note at the top of page 135. "This appendix is full of gross typographical errors—the printer having refused to send me proof sheets according to agreement. J. Torrey." The same remark would apply with equal force to No. 7. Both books show evidence that they were published either carelessly or in very great haste. The principal differences between the two documents in the botanical portions are as follows:

1. In No. 7 Prof. Torrey's general report occupies pp. 13–5 155; page 156 contains an "Explanation of the Plates;" and on pp. 157–159 is a letter from Dr. Geo. Engelmann describing (from drawings only) the Cactaceae of the Expedition, in fine print. In No. 41 Prof. Torrey's general report occupies pp. 135–155 (but the matter on the various pages is differently distributed); Dr. Engelmann's letter extends from page 155 to page 159; and *there is no* "Explanation of the Plates."

2. In No. 41 three species are entirely omitted which are given in No. 7, viz.: (*a*) *Zinnia grandiflora Nutt.*, (*b*) *Convolvulus Nuttallii*, and (*c*) *Alternanthera? (Endotheca) lanuginosa.* Of these (*a*) and (*c*) are described, and (*b*) and (*c*) are published as new names. A person having reference to these in "Emory's Mil. Rec." and looking them up in No. 41, would be puzzled at their absence, and conclude that the references were incorrect.

3. The fourteen plates in No. 7 were lithographed by E. Weber & Co., Baltimore. Those in No. 41 are similar, but were lithographed by C. B. Graham, Washington. The latter are somewhat better (or less bad), from an artistic standpoint, but there seem to be no differences of importance—save that in No. 41 plate VI. is labeled *Baileya multiflora* instead of *B. multiradiata.*

4. In both documents Appendix No. 6, occupying pp. 386–414, consists of Lieut. Abert's "report of such objects of natural history as came under my observation while I was attached to the topographical party * * * during the journey from Fort Leavenworth to Bent's Fort. The plants which were collected were submitted to the inspection of Dr. Torrey, to whom I am indebted for their names." Prof. Torrey's list, to be found on pp. 406–414, differs somewhat in the two books, but this is of little importance, for it is a mere catalogue of names, without descriptions.

I hope that this note, published in the BULLETIN, may help to prevent trouble and confusion in the future.

JOHN HENDLEY BARNHART.

TARRYTOWN, N. Y., April 20, 1895.